

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 16 and 18-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 6, 8, 14, 15 and 17 have been canceled and claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-11, 16 and 18-20 have been amended by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, a certified copy of the claimed priority document was requested; and claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Farris.

As requested in the Office Action, enclosed is a certified copy of the claimed Korean Priority Document No. 21319/2000 filed on April 20, 2000.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for discussing this application with Applicant's representative on December 2, 2004. During the discussion, the differences between the present invention and the applied art were discussed. No agreement was reached pending the Examiner's further review and when a response is officially filed.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Farris. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter similar to that recited in dependent claim 6 and to recite that the method requests the termination subscriber to select whether or not the announced calling party is automatically called back.

Independent claims 10 and 18 include similar features in a varying scope. These features are supported in the specification at least at page 11, lines 2-12 and Figures 7 and 8, for example.

Thus, according to the present invention, the termination subscriber (user) is able to selectively decide whether or not someone that has called his or her phone is automatically called back. This is particularly advantageous in that the user can simply enter a code and then phone number(s) of people that have called are displayed and the termination subscriber is able to select whether or not a respective number is automatically called back.

Regarding the subject matter recited in dependent claim 6, the Office Action indicates Farris teaches these features and cites column 12, lines 21-27 and column 15, lines 12-32. However, it is respectfully noted Farris is directed to queuing calls to a particular location, such that when resources are available, the first in the queuing is reconnected to the termination subscriber. Farris provides a specific example in which a golf course receives several calls for Tee times between 8 a.m. and 11 a.m. every Monday morning. In this example, Farris teaches that the calls are queued such that each caller is handled in the order in which the call was made (see column 9, lines 57 to column 10, line 8). Column 15, lines 12-32 describe the features in Figure 5C, for example, in which the person working at the golf course is able to prioritize certain calls or request callers have a password to access the phone system of the golf course. However, the features shown in Figure 5C of Farris do not request or allow the termination subscriber to select whether or not the calling party will automatically be called back. That is, in Farris, the calling party number is not announced

Serial No. 09/837,298
Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2004

Docket No. P-0215

and the process does not allow the operator of the golf course to determine whether or not that announced calling party is automatically called back.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 10 and 18 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably define over Farris.

In addition, during the discussion, the Examiner provided a new reference by Hirschman et al. However, it is respectfully noted this newly cited reference also does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention.

Further, the specification and drawings have been amended to correct minor informalities. It is believed no new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, David A. Bilodeau, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 09/837,298
Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2004

Docket No. P-0215

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607
and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
David A. Bilodeau
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/DAB:cre:kny
Date: December 8, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\\f4\Documents\2000\2000-085\43904.doc